

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 16-05-2003		2. REPORT TYPE FINAL		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE USAMA BIN LADEN AND AL QAEDA'S OPERATIONAL DESIGN				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) LCDR Dane Thorleifson, USN Paper Advisor (if Any): Professor John Waghelstein, Ph.D.				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Joint Military Operations Department Naval War College 686 Cushing Road Newport, RI 02841-1207				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; Distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES A paper submitted to the faculty of the NWC in partial satisfaction of the requirements of the JMO Department. The contents of this paper reflect my own personal views and are not necessarily endorsed by the NWC or the Department of the Navy.					
14. ABSTRACT The United States is in "a new kind of war" against a non state, transnational terrorist organization called al Qaeda. Although the recent nature of this war's threat both asymmetric and on American soil is largely unfamiliar, the principles being applied in this campaign are not. Al Qaeda's creator and leader, Usama bin Laden, has developed an operational design to carry out his holy war or <i>jihad</i> against the United States. Elements of this design include a defined end state and clearly articulated objectives to support his campaign strategies. He has adopted a pan-Islamic ideology in order to create a pansurgency which globally extends al Qaeda's operational reach and approach. He uses other principles of operational art such as anticipation and leverage to translate his strategies into tactical actions. He indirectly attacks the U.S. center of gravity while at the same time strengthens his own. Through the development of this operational design in concert with principles of operational art, he has largely been able to determine when and how he chooses to fight. By analyzing this threat from an operational design perspective, the United States can further identify both strengths and weaknesses of bin Laden's plan. By gaining this insight, the United States and her allies can develop ways to better defend themselves and improve on strategies which will deter, disrupt, and eventually destroy Usama bin Laden and al Qaeda.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS operational design, operational art, Usama bin Laden, al Qaeda, <i>jihad</i> , terrorist, Islamic					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 21	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Chairman, JMO Dept
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) 401-841-3556

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE
Newport, R.I.

USAMA BIN LADEN AND AL QAEDA'S OPERATIONAL DESIGN

by

Dane Thorleifson

Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy

A paper submitted to the faculty of the Naval War College in partial satisfaction of the requirements of the Department of Joint Military Operations.

The contents of this paper reflect my own personal views and are not necessarily endorsed by the Naval War College or the Department of the Navy.

Signature: _____

16 May 2003

Professor, John Waghelstein, Ph.D.
Faculty, U.S. Naval War College

Usama bin Laden and Al Qaeda's Operational Design

“Whosoever desires constant success must change his conduct with the times.”

Niccolo Machiaveli
The Prince

The United States is in “a new kind of war”¹ against a non-state, transnational terrorist organization called al Qaeda. Although the recent nature of this war's threat both asymmetric and on American soil is largely unfamiliar, the principles being applied in this campaign are not. Al Qaeda's creator and leader, Usama bin Laden, has developed an operational design to carry out his holy war or *jihad* against the United States. Elements of this design include a defined end state and clearly articulated objectives to support his campaign strategies. He has adopted a pan-Islamic ideology in order to create a “pansurgency” which globally extends al Qaeda's operational reach and approach. He uses other principles of operational art such as anticipation and leverage to translate his strategies into tactical actions. He indirectly attacks the U.S. center of gravity while at the same time strengthens his own. Through the development of this operational design in concert with principles of operational art, he has largely been able to determine when and how he chooses to fight. The al Qaeda organization has become seemingly resilient and there has been a steady stair step of “success” in their operations which have culminated, so far, into the well planned and orchestrated attacks of September 11.

History has shown that successful campaigns conducted through sound strategy and the skillful use of tactics is largely due to the successful application of operational art. Both a science and an art, operational art is dynamic with emerging doctrine and evolving definitions.² Operational art is not constrained to a certain level of warfare and

its theory and practice are applied across the entire spectrum from low intensity conflicts to high intensity conventional wars. Further, it should not be limited by associating it with only a specific command echelon or a certain force size. Simply stated, operational art's principal role is to sequence and synchronize the operational commander's forces in order to accomplish the strategic and operational objectives of his campaign.³ Under this framework, analysis of this "new kind of war" in familiar and defined terms may prove useful. Although a new student of the operational design process, it is this author's opinions that through analysis of bin Laden's operational design, we can find ways to better defend our nation and at the same time develop courses of action that will deter, disrupt and eventually destroy both bin Laden and al Qaeda.

End State and Objectives

As this paper serves to illustrate, the al Qaeda attacks against the United States which began December 29, 1992 when a bomb exploded outside a hotel in Aden, Yemen,⁴ have all been part of a well thought out terrorist campaign plan crafted by Usama bin Laden. Although a ruthless terrorist, bin Laden is by no means mindless. His operational design begins with a desired end state and is supported with well defined strategic objectives and goals. He has articulated these elements of his campaign through a series of broadcasts, interviews and published statements.

Simply stated, al Qaeda's desired end state is a united Islamic community, called the *ummah*, under strict divine Islamic law known as *Shari'a*. What bin Laden is ultimately calling for is Islamic revolution in the Islamic world itself.⁵ At first glance this appears to be an Islamic civil war. Why then is the United States being attacked? What stands in the way of bin Laden's end state is a triad of enemies consisting of the existing

Arab state “apostates,” the Western-Zionist alliance, and the “godless” communists.

With the defeat of the Soviets in Afghanistan and the subsequent fall of the Soviet Union, bin Laden now believes Islam is faced with only the two remaining threats. In the past, most Islamic fundamentalist believed the critical battle was against the “enemy who is near.” They focused on the Arab apostates and were unsuccessful.⁶ Uniquely and perhaps wisely, bin Laden has chosen to set his sights on “the enemy who is afar” first and then deal with the apostates in Islam later. The enemy who is afar is considered the West and its “artificial” creation, Israel, known by Islamic fundamentalists as the Zionist entity. These influences cannot be separated.⁷ Al Qaeda and its paranoid view of the world sees the *ummah* and true Islam being threatened with extinction by the spread of Western secularism, the policies of the modern crusaders, and the oppression from the Zionists.⁸ Specifically, bin Laden has articulated the following main strategic/military objectives in support of his campaign strategy:

1. Removal of U.S. forces from the Arabian Peninsula and complete elimination of the American presence in the Middle East.
2. Return of Palestine to the Islamic community (*ummah*).
3. Seek other means of military power such as weapons of mass destruction to aid his effort.⁹

These objectives are not just for al Qaeda terrorists but for Islamists worldwide whom bin Laden is trying to incorporate. The *ummah* is being threatened and bin Laden has called for a defensive *jihad*. Unlike an offensive *jihad* which is conducted by soldiers, a defensive *jihad* is every Muslim’s personal duty as bin Laden states, “To kill Americans

and their allies, both civil and military, is an individual duty of every Muslim who is able, in any country where this is possible.”¹⁰

By developing this strategy he is attempting to unite and gain support from the Muslim community against a common outside enemy. He has no intention of defeating America in a war but, rather intends to use the United States as a tool in order to promote his radical Islamic end state. Much like the current U.S. policy, in which President Bush has stated that nations are either with the free world or the terrorists, bin Laden has polarized the world as either true believers or infidels. Bin Laden’s strategy has cast the United States as the villain, who having been provoked will retaliate militarily for al Qaeda’s terrorist attacks, inflicting damage and causing the death of innocent Muslims throughout the world. The *ummah*’s response will be outrage and revolution causing separation between state and society in the Middle East, and the corrupt illegitimate governments allied with the West will find themselves adrift or destroyed.¹¹ These are the conditions necessary for bin Laden’s extreme Islamic ideals to take hold. In addition to identifying bin Laden’s strategic objectives and end state, it is necessary to understand how this Islamic terrorist has been able to effectively gain support for his radical cause. Much of what bin Laden used to develop his strategies he learned in Afghanistan while fighting against the Soviet Union.

Lessons Against the Soviets

Usama bin Laden was born in Saudi Arabia in 1957. In 1931, his father came from Yemen to Saudi Arabia and started a highly successful construction company with his brothers called the Bin Laden Group. The Bin Laden Group became heavily involved with government contracts and renovated the holy cities of Mecca and Medina which

made the bin Ladens highly respected by the Saudi's and amassed the family a fortune estimated in the billions of dollars.¹² Usama bin Laden was raised as a strict Islamist. In 1980, he obtained a business degree from Jeddah University in Saudi Arabia. While a student, bin Laden met Dr. Abdullah Azzam, a professor, who is considered the historical leader of the terrorist group Hamas. Also during this period, the Soviets began their invasion of Afghanistan and it is believed that bin Laden became deeply religious.¹³

In 1982, bin Laden began supporting the holy warriors or *mujahadeen* in their fight against the Soviet occupation in Afghanistan. Bin Laden began recruiting Arabs and donated construction material, equipment, and money to the resistance. He built "guesthouses" and training camps both in Afghanistan and Pakistan for the *mujahadeen* to train and stage for their operations. At the same time, Azzam founded Maktab al Khidmat (MAK). Azzam used one of bin Laden's Pakistani guesthouses as an operations center and made bin Laden his principal financier and deputy. While working for Azzam, bin Laden recruited thousands of Arab and Muslim youths for the war against the Soviets, and MAK channeled several billion dollar's worth of Western governmental, financial and material resources for the Afghan *jihad*.¹⁴ Additionally, MAK received funding from private donations and from banks which flowed funds through non-government organizations such as international relief organizations. "In addition to benefiting from the vast resources and expertise of governments channeled through domestic and foreign sources, MAK developed an independent global reach through several mosques and charities throughout the world."¹⁵

Bin Laden's experience with Azzam and the MAK was significant for three reasons. First, he learned how to finance, resource, and organize a *jihad* first hand.

Second, he understood how to broaden his financial and recruit support base by adopting a pan-Islamic vice pan-Arabic ideology and third, that a super power could be defeated. Despite the Soviets superior material power, they were seen by bin Laden as lacking faith; hence, a paper tiger which ultimately could be defeated, in time, by a much smaller and very determined force.

Al Qaeda's Operational Reach

Operational reach, the distance over which military power can mass effects and be employed decisively, is directly affected by basing and logistical support. The JCS Joint Pub 3-0 further describes this important concept:

Thus, basing in the broadest sense is an indispensable foundation of joint operational art...the arrangement and successive positioning of advanced bases underwrites the progressive ability of the joint force to shield its components from adversary action and deliver symmetric and asymmetric blows with increasing power and ferocity.¹⁶

Usama bin Laden understands this concept and has adopted an ideology which has allowed him to extend al Qaeda's operational reach.

Bin Laden formed al Qaeda, "The Base", in 1988. After the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990, bin Laden began to speak out against the Saudi rulers who had let the U.S. forces remain even after Iraq had been pushed back to its borders. Bin Laden claimed the Saudi rulers as false Muslims and hypocrites who had rejected their Islamic beliefs.¹⁷ He campaigned for the installation of a true Islamic state in Saudi Arabia. In 1991, under pressure from the Saudi government, bin Laden moved al Qaeda to Sudan where he met Hasan al-Turabi the spiritual leader of the fundamentalist Islamic Front. Turabi was part of an Islamic regime engaged in a civil war which eventually killed two million Sudanese. What bin Laden learned from Turabi was that it was possible to bring

together Islamic revolutionaries like Shiites and Sunnis to fight against a common enemy.¹⁸

Despite being deported from Saudi Arabia in 1992 and having his citizenship revoked in 1994, bin Laden put this new theory into practice. He sent several hundred *mujahadeen* veterans from the Soviet Afghan War to join Islamic groups in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. In addition to experienced forces, he supplemented these groups with finances, supplies, and words of praise. These relationships were acceptable to him because of the pan-Islamic ideology he had learned from Azzam. Bin Laden's efforts cemented ties with more than 20 Islamic terrorist groups in almost 50 countries. In return these groups have become part of his terrorist network – in effect a global coalition of terrorist groups bound together by their hatred of Western culture. As the National War College Task Force on Combating Terrorism summarizes, “Thus the world is not seeing traditional terrorism, but rather a global insurgency, indeed, a pansurgency.”¹⁹

Bin Laden now has global reach, in which he can mass asymmetrical threats and employ them decisively. Through this network of bases he can forward stage to conduct operations, coordinate activities with other terrorists, seek refuge, and share intelligence, materials, resources and personnel. This mutually supportive basing network plays a vital role in his operational approach. Through pansurgency, bin Laden has created operational reach and approach for al Qaeda; thus, making it unique from any other terrorist organization in the past.

Anticipation the Key to Planning

“Know the enemy and know yourself; in a hundred battles you will never be in Peril.”

Sun Tzu
The Art of War, 400-320 b.c.

Anticipation is the key to effective planning.²⁰ This has been an essential element throughout al Qaeda’s campaign plan which they have applied successfully.

On the strategic level, bin Laden’s overall campaign strategy is based on anticipation of U.S. military and Islamic world responses which will lead to his desired end state. Unlike what many may believe, the intended strategic effect of the September 11 attacks was not the actual deaths of thousands of U.S. civilians. Civilian and military deaths, disruption of U.S. infrastructure, financial repercussions, fear and uncertainty from the American public were all operational and tactical objectives. The true purpose of the September 11 attacks was to demonstrate that the United States was vulnerable and that it can be struck at the very symbols of its economic and military might, and most importantly to provoke a military response unlike any seen previously from Washington in the Middle East. This response would be the catalyst for Muslim unity and subsequent upheaval in the Islamic world. Al Qaeda had anticipated retaliation by the United States in Afghanistan, in fact desiring it as a demonstration to the *ummah* of Washington’s true intentions.²¹ Bin Laden’s terrorist campaign has been an escalation of major operations against the United States designed to achieve this effect. In previous large scale attacks the United States had not retaliated as al Qaeda had hoped and anticipated. Prior to September 11, the al Qaeda major operations, which included the American embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania that killed 234 people and injured 5,000, and the USS

Cole attack which killed 17 and injured 39 American sailors, were unsuccessful in provoking the necessary large scale military response al Qaeda desired. It may have been that these operations were timed and sequenced to produce a cumulative effect which when combined with the September 11 attacks would leave the United States no other choice but a major military response. Whichever the case, the United States did respond in Afghanistan and Iraq. However, as a result of these operations, al Qaeda's desired strategic effects were only partially achieved. The U.S. military response has not resulted, at least so far, in the anticipated unity and large scale upheaval within the Islamic community.

Anticipation is further used by operational commanders to avoid surprise by gaining and maintaining the initiative, and thus forcing the adversary to react rather than plan. It is the key principle in war gaming to identify probable adversary reactions.²² These considerations of anticipation are used extensively in al Qaeda's operational design. In addition to producing the desired strategic effect, al Qaeda must have anticipated that their attacks would exert tremendous pressure from the United States and her allies on their terrorist organization. For the organization to survive it had to develop escape plans, create safe havens, build deception operations and arrange other means of finance. These contingencies all had to be in place prior to September 11.²³

Protection of the leadership has been important to the continuation of al Qaeda's campaign. Through anticipation, the organization has been successful in protecting many of its key leaders. In bin Laden's case, the attacks have enhanced his personal reputation for those sympathetic to his cause. He is seen by some as the only man capable of striking such blows to a superpower and staying alive – first in Afghanistan against the

Soviets and now against the United States. In order to remain the spokesman for the Islamic uprising he must continue his propaganda which he has accomplished through his videotapes and messages. Although the government and cooperating nations are making progress in their global search and apprehension of al Qaeda members, many key personnel still remain at large. In this respect, anticipation has been vital to protecting al Qaeda leadership and their campaign.

Through anticipation, operational commanders must remain alert for the unexpected and look for opportunities to exploit their adversaries. During this process, situational awareness is essential for the operational commander. Thorough knowledge of friendly and enemy capabilities is a prerequisite to anticipating opportunities and challenges.²⁴ In preparation for their major operations, al Qaeda has been able to exploit and leverage America's free and open society to facilitate their attacks. An American society vulnerable to terrorist infiltration made the plan feasible. Readily available public information enabled the terrorists to plan and prepare for their operation. Many of the 19 terrorists which conducted the September 11 attacks had lived in the United States for months. They planned and communicated via cell phones and the internet. In order to prepare for the attack, at least four of the hijackers had taken flight instruction.

Anticipation of airline regulations and hijack responses by the pilots and crew were also foremost in the planning. The terrorist's knowledge of airline policies and screening procedures allowed them to get on board with their weapons. It was anticipation of airline and passenger reaction that dictated the near simultaneous attacks onboard the four jetliners. Once the airlines were aware of the hijackings they closed the gates and prevented other aircraft from taking off. On the planes, as soon as the passengers

realized that the terrorist were in fact conducting suicide missions they attempted to regain control of their destiny – as was seen in the fourth aircraft which crashed in Pennsylvania. Authorities have speculated and it is reasonable to assume that there are still loyal al Qaeda members residing in the United States awaiting contact and direction from al Qaeda leadership. Through anticipation of government responses and a thorough study of our capabilities, these terrorist for the most part have been able to out-maneuver authorities and U.S. forces in the battle space allowing them the ability to continue planning and preparing for future operations.

Obtaining Leverage

Leverage is considered the “center piece” of operational art. Through leverage, operational commanders gain a decisive advantage over their adversary.²⁵ In bin Laden’s operational design he incorporates strategies in an attempt to obtain this principle for his campaign. Leverage enables operational commanders to gain, maintain, and exploit advantages in combat power across all dimensions. Truly, an absurd analysis would be a force ratio comparison between al Qaeda and the United States. Although al Qaeda is considered a large transnational terrorist organization, it does not possess the personnel, equipment or capability to conduct a combined arms campaign similar to the United States. However, the concept of combat power is not necessarily deduced from force ratios – although it certainly can be. The essence of combat power is the actual capability that a force can generate in the course of mission accomplishment over another given force.²⁶ Although bin Laden has stated that he is actively seeking weapons of mass destruction, by what other means could he conceivably acquire leverage over a far larger and better equipped military? As the JCS Joint Pub 3-0 states, “...leverage can be

achieved in a variety of ways. Asymmetrical actions that pit joint force strengths against adversary weaknesses and maneuver in time and space can provide decisive advantage.”²⁷ This is precisely the strategy bin Laden has used throughout his campaign. Asymmetric operations, although conducted out of necessity by al Qaeda, are an economy of force and a weapon of choice. In effect, he is leveling the battlefield and at times even gaining and maintaining the advantage through his use of asymmetry by deciding when and where he chooses to use it.

Bin Laden realizes the overwhelming imbalance of power and technical superiority the United States possesses and therefore, calls for terrorism and guerrilla warfare in his “Declaration of War”²⁸ to gain leverage. Al Qaeda’s most loyal cadres were drawn from a 50,000 strong pool of two generations of Afghan veterans.²⁹ It can be assumed that these forces have probably been diminished due to the success of Operation Enduring Freedom. Bin Laden has taken measures in an effort to counter this reduction through his pan-Islamic ideology which has enabled him to add an estimated 20 Islamic terrorist groups in a mutually supporting network, and by calling on every Muslim everywhere for a defensive *jihad*. These numbers are still relatively small when compared to the numbers in the U.S. armed forces. However, combined with the fact that many are willing to sacrifice their lives in suicide attacks for Islam enables him to exploit his forces combat power and increase his opponent’s dilemma.

Three factors, dimensional superiority, isolation of the adversary, and the attack of adversary centers of gravity, can contribute to the operational commander’s leverage.³⁰ Although by no means capable of dimensional superiority, al Qaeda has conducted successful asymmetric attacks against American military and civilians from the land, air

and sea. These actions have essentially forced the United States to defend everywhere at once while simultaneously conducting major campaigns in the war on terrorism.

Bin Laden uses terrorism to exploit vulnerabilities in his adversary. Operational commanders can gain leverage by seeking opportunities to apply asymmetrical force against their adversaries when they are not postured for immediate tactical battle but instead are operating in more vulnerable aspects.³¹ This aspect of leverage is the basic strategy behind terrorism. Conventionally, commanders try to isolate the opposing force in order to make them more vulnerable. Al Qaeda has called for war against all Americans and thus considers them all as targets. A free and open society is inherently vulnerable. Isolation, for the purpose of vulnerability, is not necessary when the “adversary” is an unarmed civilian populace.

Another key factor contributing to leverage is the ability to influence the enemy’s center of gravity. Bin Laden attempts to disrupt America’s center of gravity indirectly. By attacking Americans, bin Laden indirectly attacks America’s center of gravity – its national will. If he has in fact strengthened or weakened it remains to be seen. Also, by these attacks, he seeks to strengthen his own center of gravity – increased support from the *ummah*. The operational factor of time also influences these two centers of gravity. As time goes on, bin Laden is building credibility in the Islamic world, at least among his followers, and creating tension between the United States and Muslim countries.³² Again, bin Laden is not trying to defeat the United States in a war but rather use it as a means to achieve his desired end state. A retaliatory response is required from the United States in the Middle East; not a protracted war. Bin Laden believes that he can influence America’s national will through casualties and cites Somalia as an example. He has

shown that he can force the United States to respond and, conversely, can convince the United States to withdraw. It may be naïve to think that al Qaeda is in an operational pause. They may be degraded to the point that they are incapable of action.

Alternatively, they may be behind the latest series of bombings in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Whichever is the case, bin Laden has two means of indirectly influencing America's center of gravity – casualties and time. Through cumulative effects of asymmetric dimensional attacks, influencing America's center of gravity, and the targeting of U.S. citizens, bin Laden is trying to create leverage in order to impose his will, increase the U.S. dilemma, and maintain the initiative.

Opposing View and Test

This analysis in no way seeks to elevate Usama bin Laden for his development of an operational design. It may be argued that this analysis simply lends too much credibility to the terrorist leader and his network; that there, in fact, is no operational design or campaign, nor any evidence of operational art. Also, that the analysis is flawed and has stretched the concepts of operational art beyond their useful meaning. For some, the attacks conducted by al Qaeda have been viewed as random acts of terrorism without the use of operational art and thus, as Milan Vego describes, “Without operational art, war would be a set of disconnected battles or engagements, with relative attrition the only measure of success or failure.”³³ The United States has learned a lesson by dismissing pieces of information and underestimating the al Qaeda threat. This paper is an analysis of that threat when viewed as a campaign plan which includes principles of operational art.

In the Naval War College “Guide for Evaluating Campaign Plans”³⁴ there is a simple four question metric which helps evaluate effective campaign plans. The questions are included below along with short answers which have been expanded on through analysis in this paper. According to the guide, a campaign plan must answer the four basic questions of operational art:

1. What conditions must be created in order to realize the strategic objective? *Unity of the ummah, U.S. forces withdrawal from the Middle East, and Islamic revolution.*
2. What sequence of events (strategy) must occur in order to create the required conditions? *Attack the United States; provoke a military response.*
3. How should forces and resources be used in order to make the sequence of events happen? *Islamic terrorist pansurgency for operational reach and approach, the use of anticipation and the gaining of leverage.*
4. What degree of risk is acceptable at each stage of the enterprise? *Any and all, to include suicide attacks and WMD.*

Based on the preceding questions and answers, the thesis of this paper appears to have some merit.

Conclusions

“Nothing is more worthy of the attention of a good general than the endeavor to penetrate the designs of the enemy.”

Niccolo Machiavelli
Discourses, 1517

Despite recent military successes in Afghanistan and Iraq, al Qaeda still remains a threat to the United States. Through research and analysis this paper illustrates that Usama bin Laden has developed an operational design to carry out his terrorist campaign.

He has a defined end state and objectives to support his campaign strategies. He chooses to fight against the United States first which will help his Islamic revolution later. While fighting against the Soviets, he adopted a pan-Islamic ideology to broaden his support base. Later, through pansurgency he greatly added to his operational reach and approach. Through these initiatives, al Qaeda is part of a mutually supportive terrorist network which allows them the capability to strike globally. Bin Laden integrates the principle of anticipation throughout his campaign plan. He seeks to gain and maintain leverage with asymmetrical attacks in an attempt to influence his adversary's center of gravity while at the same time strengthening his own. The effective uses of these principles in his design make his organization more resilient and enable him to decide when and how he chooses to conduct operations. This paper recommends that by continuing to analyze this threat from an operational design perspective, the United States can further identify both the strengths and weaknesses of bin Laden's plan. By gaining this insight, the United States and her allies can develop ways to better defend themselves and improve on strategies which will deter, disrupt, and eventually destroy Usama bin Laden and al Qaeda.

NOTES

¹ “Bush, Pataki, Giuliani, Discuss the Aftermath of the Attacks,” The Washington Post, 13 September 2001. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/transcripts/bushtext_093101.html> [31 March 2003].

² John R. Ballard, “Operational Art,” Lecture, U.S. Naval War College, Seminar 14, Newport, RI: March 2003.

³ Milan Vego, Operational Warfare (n.p.: n.p. 2000), 1.

⁴ Fortunately, U.S. troops departed their hotel the day prior to the attack enroute to Somalia. Other suspected al Qaeda attacks against the United States include: the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center, the death of 18 U.S. servicemen in Mogadishu, Somalia in 1993 by suspected al Qaeda trained terrorists, the 1995 bombing of the U.S. operated Saudi National Guard Training Center in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, the 1996 Khobar Towers bombing in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, the 1998 attacks on the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania which occurred on the anniversary of ordering U.S. troops to the Gulf region, the failed millennium bomb attack intended for Los Angeles International Airport, the 2000 attack against the USS Cole, the 2001 attacks against the World Trade Center and Pentagon, and the 2003 foreign compound attacks in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

⁵ Michael Scott Doran, “Somebody Else’s Civil War,” in How Did This Happen? Terrorism and the New War, ed. James F. Hoge, Jr., and Gideon Rose (NY: Public Affairs, 2001), 32.

⁶ Ahmed S. Hashim, “Annex A: The Worldview and Motivations of Usama Bin Ladin,” 19 December 2001, Newport Papers, Newport, RI: Naval War College, 2002.

⁷ Ahmed S. Hashim, “The Strategy of Usama Bin Laden and Al Qaeda,” 19 December 2001, Newport Papers, Newport, RI: Naval War College, 2002.

⁸ Michael Scott Doran, “Somebody Else’s Civil War,” How Did This Happen? Terrorism and the New War, ed. James F. Hoge, Jr., and Gideon Rose (NY: Public Affairs, 2001), 44.

⁹ National War College, Combating Terrorism in a Globalized World (Washington, DC: May 2002) XX.

¹⁰ Bernard Lewis, “License to Kill: Usama Bin Laden’s Declaration of Jihad,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 77, No. 6 (November-December 1998), 15.

¹¹ Michael Scott Doran, “Somebody Else’s Civil War,” How Did This Happen? Terrorism and the New War, ed. James F. Hoge, Jr., and Gideon Rose (NY: Public Affairs, 2001), 32.

¹² Yonah Alexander and Michael S. Swetnam, Usama Bin Laden’s Al-Qaida: Profile of a Terrorist Network (NY: Transnational Publishers, Inc., September 2001), 3.

¹³ Rohan Gunaratna, “Who is Al Qaeda?,” Jane’s Intelligence Review, Vol. 13, No. 8, August 2001. <<http://www.mwarrior.com/alqaeda.htm>> [12 April 2003].

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Joint Chiefs of Staff, Doctrine for Joint Operations, Joint Pub 3-0 (Washington, DC: 10 September 2001), III-16.

¹⁷ The Hypocrites of Medina. The Hypocrites were apostates who accepted true belief and then rejected it and therefore are regarded as worse than Infidels who never embraced Islam.

¹⁸ Bruce Hoffman, "Osama's Learning Curve," The National Journal, Vol. 33, No. 45 (Washington, DC: November 2001), 3510.

¹⁹ National War College, Combating Terrorism in a Globalized World (Washington, DC: May 2002), 10.

²⁰ Joint Chiefs of Staff, Doctrine for Joint Operations, Joint Pub 3-0 (Washington, DC: 10 September 2001), III-12.

²¹ Strategic Forecasting LLC, The War from Al Qaeda's Standpoint, NWC 3032, Naval War College JMO Department (np. :n.p. 17 June 2002), 2.

²² Joint Chiefs of Staff, Doctrine for Joint Operations, Joint Pub 3-0 (Washington, DC: 10 September 2001), III-12.

²³ Brian M. Jenkins, "The Organization Men Anatomy of a Terrorist Attack," in How Did This Happen? Terrorism and the New War, ed. James F. Hoge, Jr., and Gideon Rose (NY: Public Affairs, 2001), 14.

²⁴ Joint Chiefs of Staff, Doctrine for Joint Operations, Joint Pub 3-0 (Washington, DC: 10 September 2001), III-12.

²⁵ Ibid., III-14.

²⁶ Milan Vego, Operational Warfare (n.p.: n.p. 2000), 634.

²⁷ Joint Chiefs of Staff, Doctrine for Joint Operations, Joint Pub 3-0 (Washington, DC: 10 September 2001), III-14.

²⁸ "It must be obvious to you that, due to the imbalance of power between our armed forces and the enemy forces, a suitable means of fighting must be adopted i.e. using fast moving forces that work under complete secrecy. In other words to initiate guerilla warfare, where the sons of the nation, and not the military forces, take part in it. And as you know, it is wise, in the present circumstances, for the armed military forces not to be engaged in a conventional fighting with the forces of the crusader enemy." Usama bin Laden, "Declaration of War I," as translated by MSA News, 12 October 1996.

²⁹ Rohan Gunaratna, "Who is Al Qaeda?," Jane's Intelligence Review, Vol. 13, No. 8, August 2001, <<http://www.mwarrior.com/alqaeda.htm>> [12 April 2003].

³⁰ Joint Chiefs of Staff, Doctrine for Joint Operations, Joint Pub 3-0 (Washington, DC: 10 September 2001), III-14.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Strategic Forecasting LLC, The War from Al Qaeda's Standpoint, NWC 3032, Naval War College JMO Department (np. :n.p. 17 June 2002), 3.

³³ Milan Vego, Operational Warfare (n.p.: n.p. 2000), 3.

³⁴ Naval War College, A Guide for Evaluating Campaign Plans, NWC 4052A, Naval War College JMO Department (np. :n.p., n.d), 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Yohan and Michael S. Swetnam. Usama Bin Laden's Al-Qaida: Profile of a Terrorist Network. NY: Transnational Publishers, Inc., September 2001.
- Coneta, Carl. Dislocating Alcyoneus: How to Combat Al-Qaeda and the New Terrorism NWC 3011. 25 June 2002. Naval War College JMO Department. Np. : n.p. n.d.
- Doran, Michael Scott. "Somebody Else's Civil War." In How Did This Happen? Terrorism and the New War, edited by James F. Hoge, Jr., and Gideon Rose, 31-52. NY: Public Affairs, 2001.
- Fisk, Robert. "Talks With Osama Bin Laden." The Nation. NY: Nation Company L.P., 21 September 1998.
- Grange, David L. "Asymmetric Warfare: Old Method, New Concern." National Strategy Forum Review. Winter 2000. <<http://www.nationalstrategy.com/nsr/v10n2Winter00/100202.htm>> [11 April 2003].
- Gunaratna, Rohan. "Who is Al Qaeda?." Jane's Intelligence Review, Vol. 13, No. 8, August 2001. <<http://www.mwarrior.com/alqaeda.htm>> [12 April 2003].
- Hashim, S. Ahmed. "Annex A: The Worldview and Motivations of Usama Bin Ladin." 19 December 2001. Newport Papers. Newport RI: Naval War College, 2002.
- _____. "Enemy Objectives." 11 December 2001. Newport Papers. Newport RI: Naval War College, 2002.
- _____. "The Strategy of Usama Bin Laden and Al Qaeda." 19 December 2001. Newport Papers. Newport RI: Naval War College, 2002.
- Hoffman, Bruce. "Osama's Learning Curve." The National Journal. Vol. 33, No. 45. Washington, DC: May 2002.
- Landau, Elaine. Osama Bin Laden A war Against the West. Brookefield, CT: Twenty-First Centaury Books, 2002.
- Lewis, Bernard. "License to Kill: Usama bin Laden's Declaration of Jihad." Foreign Affairs, Vol. 77, No.6 (November-December 1998).
- National War College. Combating Terrorism in a Globalized World. Washington, DC: National War College, May 2002.
- Naval War College. A Guide for Evaluating Campaign Plans, NWC 4052A. Naval War College JMO Department. Np. : n.p. n.d.

“Osama Bin Laden’s Global ‘Al-Qaeda’ Organisation –Its Strategies and Issues Cut Down to Size in Authoritative Report.” Jane’s Intelligence Review. 13 August 2001. <http://www.janes.com/press/pc010813_1.shtml> [12 April 2003].

Pillar, Paul R. Terrorism and U.S. Foreign Policy. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press, 2001.

Resselaer, Lee and Raphael Perl. Terrorism, the Future, and U.S. Foreign Policy. Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 08 January 2003.

Sheler, Jeffrey L. “Muslim in America.” U.S. News and World Report. (October 2001).

Strategic Forecasting LLC. The War from Al Qaeda’s Standpoint, NWC 3032. Naval War College JMO Department. Np. : n.p., 17 June 2002.

U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. Doctrine for Joint Operations. Joint Pub 3-0. Washington, DC: 10 September 2001.

_____. Joint Doctrine Capstone and Keystone Primer. Washington, DC: 10 September 2001.

Vego, Milan. Operational Warfare. N.p.: n.p., 2000.

_____. Operational Warfare Addendum, NWC 1001A. N.p.: n.p., September 2002.